



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/805,808	03/13/2001	Reiner Kraft	ARC920000147US1	6210

2512 7590 08/22/2003

PERMAN & GREEN  
425 POST ROAD  
FAIRFIELD, CT 06824

EXAMINER

THAI, HANH B

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2171

DATE MAILED: 08/22/2003

6

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

pre

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/805,808	KRAFT ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Hanh B Thai	2171	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on the Amendment 7/7/03.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                      4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                      5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_                      6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Art Unit: 2171

This is in response to the amendment filed July 7, 2003.

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lang et al. (U.S. Patent no. 6,314,420) in view of Sharnoff et al. (U. S. Patent no. 6,314,421).

1. Regarding claims 1, 14, 20 and 22 Lang discloses a system for associating a credibility rating with a document located in an online search comprising:

- an information gathering device (16, Fig. 1, Lang) adapted to retrieve the document from an information source (11 and 13, Fig. 1, Lang).
- an information analysis device (17 and 35, Fig. 1, Lang) adapted to determine an online id associated with the document (see col. 6, line 59 to col. 7, line 8 and col. 12, lines 39-45, Lang); and
- a credibility rating system (400, Fig. 6, Lang) adapted to retrieve at least one credibility rating (see Fig. 6 and col. 14, lines 26-67, Lang)

Lang, however, does not explicitly disclose "the credibility rating associated with the online ID". Sharnoff, on the other hand, discloses a document indexing mechanism including the step of retrieving credibility rating from the database associated with the online ID document (see col. 4, lines 48-57, col. 6, lines 56-58 and col. 9, lines 31-35,

Art Unit: 2171

Sharnoff). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Land to include an online ID in order to identify and retrieve the credibility rating in the credibility database as taught by Sharnoff. The motivation of doing so would have been to ameliorate “information pollution” problems (see col. 3, lines 41-44, Sharnoff).

2. Regarding claim 2, Lang/Sharnoff combination further discloses a searchable index adapted to store an association of the credibility rating of the online id with the document, wherein the association is accessible by a search engine (see col. 11, lines 51-55, Lang).

3. Regarding claim 3, Lang/Sharnoff combination further discloses the mapping of a unique identifier associated with the document to the associated credibility rating (see col. 19, lines 9-19, Lang).

4. Regarding claim 4, Lang/Sharnoff combination does not explicitly disclose that the web page has a unique identifier comprising a uniform resource locator, but it well known in web document. “uniform resource locator” is the address of document of Lang in the “distributed network resources” (13, Fig. 1, Lang).

5. Regarding claim 5, Lang/Sharnoff combination further discloses that the online search is an Internet search and the document is retrieved from the Internet (see col. 5, lines 1-5, Sharnoff).

6. Regarding claims 6, 8 and 12, Lang/Sharnoff combination further discloses “a user interface” (5,7, 9, Fig. 1, and col. 6, line 59 to col. 7, line8), “input validator” (see col. 5, lines 1-12 and 7, lines 26-35, Lang) and “...allow a third party to access the credibility rating...” (see col. Col. 5, lines 25-35 and col 7, lines 46-62, Lang).

Art Unit: 2171

7. Regarding claims 7 and 11, Lang/Sharnoff combination further discloses “determine a weight of the statement based on a statement analysis” (see col. 8, lines 9-18 and col. 15, lines 29-64, Lang).
8. Regarding claims 9 and 13, Lang/Sharnoff combination further discloses “the credibility database adapted to allow a third party to submit a query” (see col. 5, lines 36-50, Lang).
9. Regarding claim 10, Lang discloses a credibility rating system comprising:
- a user interface adapted to allow an owner of an online id to input credibility information associated with a document into the system for validation (5,7, 9, Fig. 1, and col. 6, line 59 to col. 7, line8);
  - an input validator coupled to the user interface in correct verify that the inputted credibility information is correct and to rate the inputted credibility information in the form of a credibility rating (see col. 5, lines 1-12 and 7, lines 26-35, Lang);
  - an application service interface adapted to allow a third party to access the credibility rating from the credibility database (see col. Col. 5, lines 25-35 and col 7, lines 9-62, Lang). “community profiles” corresponds to the “credibility database”.

Lang, however, does not explicitly disclose “the credibility rating associated with the online ID”. Sharnoff, on the other hand, discloses a document indexing mechanism including the step of retrieving credibility rating from the database associated with the online ID document (see col.4, lines 48-57, col. 6, lines 56-58 and col. 9, lines 31-35, Sharnoff). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

Art Unit: 2171

invention to modify Land to include an online ID in order to identify and retrieve the credibility rating in the credibility database as taught by Sharnoff. The motivation of doing so would have been to ameliorate "information pollution" problems (see col. 3, lines 41-44, Sharnoff).

10. Regarding claim 15, Lang/Sharnoff combination further discloses the step of determining an online id of a document comprises the step of extracting an author information code (see col. 6, lines 1-13, Sharnoff). In order to parse, the information code would be extracted.

11. Regarding claim 16, Lang/Sharnoff combination further discloses the step of developing a credibility rating for an online id, the method comprising the steps of: receiving an input from the online id related to a credibility profile for the online id (11 and 13, Fig.1, Lang); validating the input by determining a weight of the input (320,330 and 345, Fig.5, and col.15, lines 37-64, Lang); assigning the credibility rating to the online id (col.15, lines 29-32, Lang); and storing the credibility rating in a searchable index (see col.12, lines 27-32, Lang).

12. Regarding claim 17, Lang/Sharnoff combination further discloses the step of integrating the credibility rating vector into a search engine using a ranking algorithm (see col. 6, lines 23-25 and col.13, line 66 to col.14, line10, Lang).

13. Regarding claim 18, Lang/Sharnoff combination does not explicitly disclose the step of reordering a search result list, but it is well known to rearrange the search result list because it would provide the flexibility of the searching system.

Art Unit: 2171

14. Regarding claim 19, Lang/Sharnoff combination further discloses the step of displaying a symbol on the information indicating the quality rating to the user (see 235, Fig.4 and col.11, line 64 to col.12, line 5, Lang).

15. Regarding claims 24-26, Lang/Sharnoff combination further discloses "credibility rating that corresponds to the subject matter of the document" (see col. 4, lines 34-40, Sharnoff).

### *Response to Arguments*

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-26 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### *Conclusion*

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hanh B Thai whose telephone number is 703-305-4883. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 AM - 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on 703-308-1436. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Hanh Thai #T  
Art Unit 2171  
August 18, 2003

  
SAFET METJAHIC  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100